

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

DATE: June 22-23, 2006

PLACE: Red Cross Service Club /E. B.
Hamilton Hall, Ft. Vancouver
Vancouver, Washington

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER.....	3
CONSENT AGENDA.....	4
MANAGEMENT & STATUS REPORTS.....	4
PROGRAM RESULTS – TRACKING THE LAST DECADE	4
WORK SESSION: URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT – PAST RESULTS AND SELECTION CRITERIA.....	5
LARGE-SCALE LONG-RANGE CONSERVATION STRATEGIES	6
2007-2009 BUDGET PROCESS STRATEGIC PLAN/PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	7
2007-2009 OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGETS.....	8
Executive Session (Director Review).....	9
BOARD ETHICS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST.....	9
URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT – PAST RESULTS AND SELECTION CRITERIA (CONTINUED)	11
STRATEGIC PLAN/PERFORMANCE MEASURES	13

BOATING CONSTITUENT PERSPECTIVES.....	14
KING COUNTY “60 ACRES” SITE – CONVERSION RESCISSION REQUESTS	16
REPORTS FROM PARTNERS AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.....	18

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

Day 1

DATE: June 22-23, 2006

PLACE: Red Cross Service Club /E. B.
Hamilton Hall, Ft. Vancouver
Vancouver, Washington

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Val Ogden, Chair	Vancouver
Karen Daubert	Seattle
Bill Chapman	Mercer Island
Steven Drew	Olympia (first meeting)
Jeff Parsons	Leavenworth
Mark Quinn	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife

IT IS INTENDED THAT THIS SUMMARY BE USED WITH THE NOTEBOOK PROVIDED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.
A RECORDED TAPE IS RETAINED BY IAC AS THE FORMAL RECORD OF MEETING.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Chair Val Ogden called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

The Chair welcomed everyone and asked committee members to introduce themselves.

The Board was welcomed by City of Vancouver Mayor, Royce Pollard. Mayor Pollard thanked the IAC for all it has contributed to the area, the birthplace of Northwest history. The Mayor informed the Board that Chair Ogden recently received the *Citizen of the Year Award* for Vancouver and he shared with the group all she has contributed to the community.

Director Laura Johnson thanked the Mayor and noted what a good partner Vancouver has been with the IAC.

Park Director, David Judd, welcomed the Board and explained his role and connection with Chair Ogden.

The agenda was reviewed and adjusted to have the Urban Wildlife Habitat (UWH) presentation on day one of the meeting with additional discussion on this item on day two.

CONSENT AGENDA

(See notebook item #2)

Reviewed Resolution #2006-17 June 2006 Consent Calendar approving:

- a. IAC Minutes – April 18, 2006
- b. Time Extensions

Jeff Parsons **MOVED** approval of Resolution #2006-17. Karen Daubert **SECONDED**. Board **APPROVED** as presented.

MANAGEMENT & STATUS REPORTS

Director's Report

Director Laura Johnson presented this written report. (See notebook item #3a for details.)

Director Johnson reviewed the new format of Board packets starting with this meeting. She indicated this is an effort to sharpen up the materials and eliminate extra documents where possible.

Karen Daubert asked about the dedication in Sand Point and asked if it had occurred. Director Johnson wasn't sure of the status as she hadn't received any additional information.

Chair Ogden asked about the Joint Legislative Audit Review Committee (JLARC) report and if they really want a summary of all the programs.

Director Johnson reported on the status of this report.

PROGRAM RESULTS – TRACKING THE LAST DECADE

Bruce Crawford presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #4 and presentation handout for details.)

Bruce provided a presentation on habitat acquisitions over the past decades. Director Johnson stressed that this is still a work in progress and a beginning for staff to start working on the numbers and the best way to present this information.

Steven Drew asked about the funding and would like to see the amount of money leveraging the projects.

Bruce responded that IAC is only showing its side of the acquisition for this report.

Director Johnson stated that some of the categories of Washington Wildlife Recreation Program (WWRP) for Habitat (Critical Habitat), encourage, but do not require matching funds from state agencies. This shows the presentation is a work in progress.

Mark Quinn discussed how some of these grants leverage other funds that might not

show such as Federal funds the Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) has received due to the Washington Wildlife Recreation Program (WWRP) funds that have come in.

The Board discussed other details on this information.

The Chair noted the “determining effectiveness” questions Bruce presented are good.

Bruce noted that he will be using these questions at the end of the presentation in the staff recommendation.

Staff Recommendations:

- Adopt measurable outcomes for acquisitions.
- Invest sufficient dollars in monitoring to determine what programs are meeting species and ecosystem-biodiversity goals.
- Work with grant recipients to determine acquisition targets where possible.

Steve discussed how purchasing acreage isn't always the way to bring back a species, and that it may be some other issue that actually assists in the outcome. Need a target on what is available and what is lost.

Jeff Parsons noted it is wrong to have a single species focus and that it should be more generalized.

Bruce agreed and noted how the IAC is now providing administrative support to the IAC, Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB), Monitoring Forum, Biodiversity Council, and Invasive Species Council (ISC) and that the programs all intermingle and need to coordinate with each other.

Mark Quinn asked if Bruce had read the “Lands 2020” report. He would rather not see Bruce focus on the acquisition side of protection and restoration. He cautioned the Board to not look at acquisition, but the real questions are: 1) How much are we willing to risk? and 2) How much do we want to save for biodiversity of the state? Mark stated we will never be able to purchase enough land in Washington State to preserve the current level of diversity; we need to have a partnership with the private land owners to protect this.

WORK SESSION: URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT – PAST RESULTS AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #10 and presentation handout for details.)

Jim presented the following questions to the Board:

- Is the current focus of the Urban Wildlife Habitat (UWH) category still appropriate?
- Should we give localities more flexibility to establish their own priorities?
- Should measures of success of the UWH be formalized?

Discussion:

Bill Chapman noted that in the Strategic Plan the Board has already asked staff to develop measures of success. Bill would like this done in the next twelve months. Bill also noted that Jim presented an excellent staff report on this issue. Jim noted that Carole Richmond spent a lot of time working on this presentation.

Jeff Parsons discussed the need to have Urban Wildlife Habitat (UWH) closer to people since this program is supposed to bring nature to people and we shouldn't take it farther away through application of grant evaluation criteria.

Steven Drew talked about the Growth Management Act (GMA) and how this is affecting urban wildlife.

Public Testimony:

Mike Ryherd, Washington Wildlife Recreation Coalition (WWRC), stated that the applicants read what you do, measure carefully with incremental changes having large results. Also, the Legislature did choose to deal with this in the last biennium by providing 60 percent of the funding to the State and 40 percent to local governments. The Legislature did not deal the location of the habitat. Local Governments feel like they are being outgunned in the Urban Wildlife category. He applauds measuring what we have done, but feels it is extremely dangerous to measure whether we are meeting someone else's definition of need.

LARGE-SCALE LONG-RANGE CONSERVATION STRATEGIES

Governor's Puget Sound Initiative (See notebook item 5b for details.)

Director Johnson introduced this agenda item and reviewed items in the notebook. She referred to the chart created by the Office of Financial Management (OFM) listing the various grant programs throughout state government. Director Johnson stressed that strategic plans are driving the Salmon side of the agency through the recovery plan process. This is a way for the Salmon Recovery Funding Board to be informed rather than just being driven by programs.

Director Johnson introduced this Biodiversity Council presentation as an example of a larger scale program, housed within the IAC, which needs to be brought more into the work of both the IAC and the SRFB. The newly created Invasive Species Council is another example of the coordination role the IAC plays.

Biodiversity Council Executive Coordinator, Lynn Helbrecht, and Chair Maggie Coon, provided an overview of the Biodiversity Council and its ground work, plus work on the 30 year strategy. (See notebook item #5a for details and handouts.)

Biodiversity Chair Maggie Coon defined biodiversity as the full range of life in all its forms. Her favorite definition is the "web of life" that includes all plant and animal life.

The following are highlights from Maggie's presentation:

In 2002, the Biodiversity Conservation Act was passed by the Legislature recognizing biodiversity as an important concept. A temporary committee developed the first strategy report in October 2003. One recommendation was creation of a Biodiversity Council encouraging public and private participation, involving local landowners and private entities.

The Biodiversity Council was established in 2004 by Governor Locke through Executive Order #04-02.

The Executive Order directives include:

1. Assess landowner stewardship incentives
2. Conduct pilot projects for two eco-regions
3. Develop a public education and outreach strategy
4. Deliver a 30-year, comprehensive, prioritized strategy

The Council recently launched its new website: www.biodiversity.wa.gov.

Maggie closed by encouraging dialogue and discussion on biodiversity conservation.

Board Discussion:

Mark Quinn asked what the difference is in the biodiversity strategy from the WDFW Comprehensive Plan (CWCS).

Lynn explained that the biodiversity strategy looks at more than just the wildlife side.

Maggie complimented Lynn on her good work on the Biodiversity Council.

2007-2009 BUDGET PROCESS STRATEGIC PLAN/PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Presented by Director Johnson, Bruce Crawford, and Mark Jarasitis. (See notebook item #6 for details.)

Bruce reviewed the latest version of the strategic plan to get the Board's final approval as this report is due to the Office of Financial Management next week.

This document combines Government Management Accountability and Performance (GMAP), and Priorities of Government (POG) performance measures and strategic planning for the office as well as all the different boards and councils the IAC provides support to.

Board Discussion:

Chair Ogden was concerned with Goal 4 not having the word "health" included.

Jeff Parsons agreed with the need to include "health" in the goal. Bruce will update Goal 4 to include the word "health".

Director Johnson and Bruce discussed other details in the plan and budget issues.

Public Testimony:

No public testimony on this agenda item.

The Board will wait until after the budget discussion before making the decision to approve the document.

2007-2009 OPERATING AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

Presented by Director Johnson and Mark Jarasitis. (See notebook item #7 for details.)

Mark reviewed the appropriation summary sheet included in the notebook. The summary sheet covers the grants budgets, operating budget, other programs administered by IAC, and the total amount. The Board needs to decide on the amount to propose for the Washington Wildlife Recreation Program (WWRP). Three levels of possible funding allocations were presented to the Board for discussion: \$50 million, \$75 million and \$100 million.

Director Johnson reviewed Resolution #2006-18 for the Board with the two different budgets, capital and operating, needing Board approval at this meeting.

Bill Chapman made a **MOTION** to provide the Director authority to develop the final operating budget and support approval of a \$100 million budget request for WWRP. Jeff Parsons **SECONDED**.

Public Testimony/Discussion:

Maggie Coon, The Nature Conservancy, spoke on behalf of the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition (WWRC) supporting the \$100 million funding request. She explained 1) a major need; 2) "big tent" scenario with the Legislature adding Riparian and Agriculture interests to the program; and 3) offering a lasting legacy.

Chair Ogden asked what kind of groundwork had been done with stakeholders.

Mike Ryherd, WWRC, outlined the reasoning behind the \$100 million request and who the WWRC is working with to promote this budget request.

Jeff asked if there are good examples of projects that haven't been funded in the past.

Mike explained that there are projects that haven't received funding.

Mike showed the Board that \$154 million in projects were proposed with matching funds raising this up to \$315 million.

The Board **APPROVED** Resolution #2006-18 with the \$100 million request for WWRP.

Meeting recessed for local tour at 2:50 p.m.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION SUMMARY MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

Day 2

DATE: June 23, 2006

PLACE: Red Cross Service Club /E. B.
Hamilton Hall, Ft. Vancouver
Vancouver, Washington

TIME: 9:30 a.m.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Val Ogden, Chair	Vancouver
Karen Daubert	Seattle
Bill Chapman	Mercer Island
Steven Drew	Olympia (first meeting)
Jeff Parsons	Leavenworth
Mark Quinn	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife

IT IS INTENDED THAT THIS SUMMARY BE USED WITH THE NOTEBOOK PROVIDED IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.
A RECORDED TAPE IS RETAINED BY IAC AS THE FORMAL RECORD OF MEETING.

Executive Session (Director Review)

The Board members called an Executive Session at 8:30 a.m. to discuss the Director's annual review and other personnel issues. The Executive Session finished at 9:30 a.m.

REGULAR MEETING RECONVENED

Chair Val Ogden reconvened the regular meeting at 9:36 a.m. and asked staff and Board members to reintroduce themselves as there were many new audience members.

BOARD ETHICS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Paul Silver, State Investment Board, Assistant Attorney General, presented this agenda item. (See notebook item #9 and handouts for details.)

Paul stated the two overview ethics principles he will review throughout his presentation relevant to this commission are:

- State officers and employees can't use public position for personal gain or for private advantage,
- State officers and employees may not receive anything, except from the state, for performing, omitting, or deferring the performance of any official duty.

He discussed the reasoning behind his suggesting the Board adopt the Model Rules For Boards and Commissions.

In the recusal process, Director Johnson asked about having agency directors on the Board. How can they vote on a list that has one of their agency's projects up for funding?

Paul believes this would be allowed as it is in the interest of the state. The problem would come if the representative on the Board was also the person who developed the grant proposal, promoted the proposal, and would be working on the grant, if funded, as part of their job.

Paul reviewed the Model Rules and explained the different rules.

Paul then reviewed scenarios that had been sent to him from the Board members.

Steven Drew asked if there is a difference between being employed with the state versus being paid by the state such as in a contracted position.

Paul stated yes, and appreciated the question.

Director Johnson asked about the community interest side of things, i.e. if a Board member is a volunteer with an interest group.

Paul reported that in Model Rule 1, grant recommendations, there has to be a beneficial tie-in and monetary gain before it is a problem. In Model Rule 2, there may be an issue and recusal would have to take place; it's not for money.

Paul reported that if there are issues that come up, he is available, along with Susan Thomsen, Assistant Attorney General and the Ethics Board to help sort out any of these issues for the IAC.

Paul recommended that the IAC adopt the Model Rules.

Director Johnson indicated this would be a lengthy process.

Discussion:

Bill Chapman said a problem with the Board having a list before them would be that most of the Board members would need to recuse. How does the Legislature handle this?

Paul reported that the Legislature doesn't fall under the same rules. For this commission, the Board may want a rule that has a disclosure process, but would be able to vote on the full list.

Paul suggested that the Board work on a possible ethics policy for this Board to work under and then have the Ethics Board review it. From all he has seen from the IAC, the grant process is very open and clear.

Jeff Parsons doesn't see that this Board has much influence under individual projects. The Board has an overall policy role, but by the time the list gets to the Board it has already been reviewed and ranked. Jeff noted that his wife is the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Habitat Program Regional Director and that he doesn't know about the projects. He asked if he should disclose this relationship during each funding cycle.

Paul noted this would be very helpful and beneficial to do that, but difficult to write it in theoretical terms.

Chair Ogden thanked Paul for his time, materials and responding to the Board's particular issues.

URBAN WILDLIFE HABITAT – PAST RESULTS AND SELECTION CRITERIA (CONTINUED)

Initial presentation was held on day one of the meeting.

Karen Daubert reviewed the presentation Jim Fox provided on day one of this meeting. (See notebook Item #10 for details.)

She thanked Jim for his introductory paper and Carole Richmond for her tremendous amount of work on the presentation.

The two issues Karen believes should be addressed are:

- 1) Is there a problem from the 1999 change and the end result? (more funds for highly valued habitat) and
- 2) If there is a need for change, how to go about doing that?

Karen outlined her comments stating no one would argue about the important high quality property, but the change in 1999 caused the pendulum to swing dramatically so that the projects closer to urban areas were not getting funded. Karen expanded on her concerns around this issue. Karen would like to see the Board change this policy and suggested the following:

- Change the definition from proximity to urban center.
- Look at weight of criteria and go back to pre-99 criteria or something similar to it.
- Look at the measures of success.

Mark Quinn asked Karen why the shift towards ecological quality began in 1999? Karen indicated it was not clear.

Jim Fox reported that this was partly due to the recommendations by the stakeholder group that was involved in the reform of the program and also a trend in looking at parcels of habitat land not in isolation, but how they fit into the overall ecosystem and biodiversity of the area; and a trend in general on how we manage and preserve our natural resources.

Mark agrees with Karen. He feels it is very important to have agreement on the definition of urban wildlife habitat and what the Board expects to accomplish. Perhaps it is not appropriately named and should be changed to better reflect what the intent of the program is.

Steven Drew talked about his involvement in Issaquah planning. He believes the Board needs to look to the future and apply strategy to best preserve habitat and yet keep balance.

Jeff is in agreement to revisit this policy; he is not sure the name needs to change.

Director Johnson reported that the list of this year's 16 Urban Wildlife Habitat projects include many projects from cities. She reiterated that nothing can be changed in this grant cycle; any change would be two years out.

Director Johnson read a faxed letter into the record on the issue of urban wildlife habitat from Craig Partridge, who could not be at the meeting. The letter highlights the Department of Natural Resources' perspective on the Urban Wildlife Habitat category within WWRP and its major stake in this discussion.

Bill Chapman agrees with many of Craig and Steve's points and explained his thinking behind any changes to the program. The Board can't change the process or name this year since it is a legislative mandate, but you can look at the criteria and policies. He would like staff help in proposing policy changes that provide better success for locations close to schools, special needs, etc.

Bill would also like to include this issue in the "work plan" for this next year.

Chair Ogden pointed out the changes and wants to look at the criteria to make the changes and find a balance. The Board needs to have guidelines in place before the next grant round.

Director Johnson stated there are two steps; first, involving stakeholders to offer options to begin active conversation and secondly, would work on the substance of those conversations and recommend changes in the criteria. She is not promising timelines, but it needs to be done.

Steven would like to an aggressive timeline in order to make changes before the next grant cycle. He would also like to see a half-page newsletter sent out to the grant recipients informing them about changes so that enough stakeholders know what is happening.

Chair Ogden reiterated that part of the process is involving those stakeholders and making sure they are aware of the process.

Director Johnson noted that the next grant cycle is May 1, 2008, and there will be lots of contact with the stakeholders before this happens. The public process part can take six to nine months, including working with an Advisory Committee.

Public Testimony:

Maxine Keesling, presented a letter to the Board on urban wildlife habitat.

STRATEGIC PLAN/PERFORMANCE MEASURES

(Continued from day one discussion.)

Chair Ogden called for a motion for the approval of the Strategic Plan Performance Measures. Jeff Parsons **MOVED** to adopt Resolution #2006-18. Mark Quinn **SECONDED**.

Board Discussion:

Steven Drew expressed concern with pages 11 and 40 of the Strategic Plan. He felt the hardened urban, multi-use trails study was the wrong study to do. He feels the more important study is what the demand on trails is and what's the comparative demand on various types of trails.

Bill Chapman felt Steve raised an important point.

Mark Quinn stated that he did not realize this goal would be adopted since the discussion a year ago.

Karen Daubert recalled the Strategic Plan was passed out in April for review with discussion to be at the June meeting and the trail category was added.

Director Johnson explained that goal number 4 is to meet the State Mobility Priorities of Government (POG) goal which is transportation and how IAC's work in trails contributes to transportation.

Neil Aaland commented in support of Director Johnson's statements that, at last July's IAC Board Meeting, a report on a proposed update of the 1991 trails plan was presented by Jim Eychaner. He proposed to link any update to the transportation POG and to the other POG on health by stressing the proximity of trail opportunities to urban areas.

Chair Ogden would like to adopt the Strategic Plan with provisions and if the Board has any changes or concerns get those to Director Johnson.

Bill Chapman will vote with the Chair. He would like a redline version in the future so he can track the changes made.

Chair Ogden agreed and requested a note on where this changes.

Karen asked about not requesting \$200,000 just for an urban trail planning study, but recommends having it for all trails and a trail plan.

Chair Ogden asked if \$200,000 would be enough?

Steven Drew indicated this would be complicated study.

Bill Chapman followed up on Neil's comments and his discussions with Jim Eychaner. This issue compares with the trail issue that Jim Eychaner discussed in a meeting last fall with one of the points being the connecting of trails between different communities. Local governments do want help with their regional trails.

Chair Ogden stated this meets the intent of what was discussed.

Jeff Parsons stated the study could be more explicit about those other connections.

The Board **APPROVED** Resolution #2006-18.

BOATING CONSTITUENT PERSPECTIVES

This agenda item was presented by Michael Campbell, President, Northwest Marine Trade Association (NMTA) (See notebook item #11 and handouts for details.)

Michael has been with the NMTA almost seven years and plans to be there another three years. NMTA is comprised of 900 businesses that build recreational boats, sell them, and operate marinas or boatyards for service or repair. It is the largest marine trade association in the country. Their goal is to grow recreational boating.

Michael discussed the boating in the state.

Chair Ogden asked what size and kind of boat has to be registered.

Michael said 16 feet or larger, 10 horse power or more, as well as jet skis.

Michael's assumptions are: boating is good for the state, the state should encourage boating, and Washington State can serve our boaters better.

In order to do this, Michael is requesting funding for a study to determine how to serve our boaters better in the state of Washington.

Questions to answer that would help the boating industry:

- How are we doing serving boaters?
- Could we do a better job?
- What would it cost?
- Does it make any economic sense?
- How would the state benefit?
- How would citizens benefit?

Michael would like to take a holistic look at boating before specific needs are addressed such as boater safety.

Ideas for the task force:

- Look into a Department of Boating or a Council.
- Explore setting the marine gas tax percentage at 1 percent cap on the gas tax.

Karen Daubert asked Director Johnson her thoughts on this request.

Director Johnson reviewed the history of the IAC as custodians of the Initiative 215 money for the boating facilities program, the foundation of statutes for this agency. It provides funds for boating services and a lot of other recreation services assisting with a portion of administrative costs. Director Johnson believes, in the short term, it would be a good opportunity for the IAC to assist in funding a portion of this study. Boaters deserve to have the conversation and see where it leads.

Karen asked how much money would be needed.

Michael didn't have an answer for this, but presented a memo with suggestions.

Chair Ogden would like to have staff work with Michael to look at this issue and see if there is money available.

Michael commented it is a really good public policy conversation.

Mark Quinn knows there isn't a Department of Boating, so who do the boaters go to now? Is it the Coast Guard, States Parks Department Boaters Safety Program, Marine Trade or others or a combination?

Michael indicated the Association mostly interfaces with the Department of Licensing (DOL) and the Department of Revenue (DOR) where they get half a percent excise tax on boats plus the sales tax on boats.

Steven Drew asked about the history of gas tax money. Has it gone up consistently with the increase in fuel consumption?

Director Johnson responded it has been a little bit sticky and bumpy, but remains 18 cents per gallon and will be going up, but not to the full 28 cents per gallon.

Jim Fox responded that he was not sure where IAC was in the biennial increase, but every four years, by statute, the Department of Licensing does a study to see what portion of all the gas tax collected in the state is attributable to recreational boating. The last three cycles, the money has gone down and IAC is now at 9.97 percent. Also, every time the Legislature has increased the gas tax, they have capped the amount of pennies per gallon going to boating, always a nickel lower which goes to highways.

Director Johnson stated today's boating presentation is historic since the IAC has had such a deep history with the boating community. They are a vital constituency made up of the port associations, institutional partners and now business partners. The IAC staff is committed to be part of something that comes from this discussion.

KING COUNTY "60 ACRES" SITE – CONVERSION RESCISSION REQUESTS

This agenda item was presented by Marguerite Austin. (See notebook item #12 for details.)

Marguerite reviewed the history of the property.

Sharon Claussen with King County Parks, provided the Board with an update on the County's actions. King County is working with the Soccer Association to develop a Use Agreement that will be brought to the IAC for review of compliance. This will keep the property open to the public for free at specific times during the year and would keep this publicly owned. They are trying very hard to balance the needs of all the groups.

Chair Ogden asked what percentage of the time is seen as free time.

Sharon didn't have a number for that, but the soccer season is generally August through fall. It will be written into the contract, no details now, but will be between November and spring when there is no soccer schedule.

Chair Ogden also asked who controls the scheduling.

Sharon responded the scheduling will be set up with blocks of time. The Soccer Association will have certain blocks of time to schedule, the county will schedule the other set times, and there will be open times laid out in the contract.

Steve asked what the selling points were for the original purchase of this site. Were the soaring clubs involved then? How can the revenue generating group have the priority over the public use?

Sharon reported that the county can't afford to develop a soccer field and the soccer fields provide recreation for more people than the soaring association would. The county can serve more soccer youth.

Chair Ogden reported that the IAC does not have a role in this issue, but wanted to provide a forum to make information available on both sides of this issue. The Chair reiterated there will be no action taken by the Board.

Marguerite continued reviewing the history of this project. The Board had approved a conversion request for this property, then the county withdrew the request.

Public Testimony:

Signe Alsin, citizen, provided her views on this agenda item.

A video was provided on the reason to keep this park as an open space.

Signe requested that the Board not approve the long-term lease of the 60 acres park.

Stew Konzen provided a presentation on the properties and how the land has changed over the years from 1969 to 2006.

Scott Odle provided his thoughts on this issue. He is not against soccer, but wants to see this park kept as an open space. It will not create diversity as King County stated it would.

Chuck Quenneville spoke in opposition to the lease and believes the existing lease has been mismanaged.

Chuck's group recommends the following:

- Honor commitments made to the 1968 "forward thrust" open-space voters.
- Honor the purpose of original IAC funding.
- The IAC use their influence with King County to keep the last remaining 34 acres of open space out of the 346 acres park that originally started for passive recreation.

Karen Daubert thanked the group for their passionate presentation and commitment. When the time comes to review the Use Agreement she will seriously consider today's testimony by the soaring club.

Chair Ogden asked Marguerite Austin to update the Board on what is happening next.

Marguerite informed the Board that staff is working with King County and once they have their Use Agreement ready, IAC will review and make sure it complies with the terms of IAC's original project Agreement and General Provisions. If everything is acceptable, the IAC would grant approval. As part of the normal process, IAC would periodically do a site visit and make sure it is open and in compliance.

Chair Ogden asked about the sign that kept public out. Marguerite wasn't aware of this sign and referred this issue back to King County.

Chuck said the sign was removed after about four or five months and following meetings with King County.

Marguerite informed the Board that as long as the county is using the property for recreation, IAC doesn't have a role in how it is being managed.

Maxine Keesling talked about her concerns and issues on 60-acres. She believes King County has not done what they were supposed to do. She let the Board know that King County has not put the trail in yet for the conversion.

REPORTS FROM PARTNERS AND PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

This time is set aside for agencies' reports, and issues not otherwise identified as agenda items.

There were no partner reports.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 1:19 p.m.



Val Ogden, Chair

Next Meeting: September 21 & 22, 2006, Fort Worden, Port Townsend

Note: At the September 21-22, 2006, IAC meeting, prior to approval of the June 22-23, 2006 meeting minutes, Karen Daubert expressed her concern with the Urban Wildlife Habitat Program discussion reflected in the June minutes. She wanted to make sure that it was clear that complete consensus was obtained concerning revision of the Urban Wildlife Habitat Program policies prior to the next grant cycle. See September 21-22, 2006, meeting summary for additional information concerning this topic.

RESOLUTION #2006-17
June 2006 Consent Agenda

BE IT RESOLVED, that the following June 2006, Consent Agenda items are approved:

- a) Approval of IAC Minutes – April 18, 2006, and
- b) Time Extensions

Moved by: Jeff Parsons

Seconded by: Karen Daubert

Adopted / Defeated / Deferred (underline result)

Date: June 22, 2006

Attachment A Time Extension Request for Board Approval Consent Calendar - Resolution #2006-19						
Project #	Sponsor Name	Project Name	Grant Program	Board Funded	Extension Requested	Circumstance or Reasons for Delay
02-1252D	City of Woodinville	Rotary Community Park Development	LWCF ¹	9/19/02	3/31/07	City of Woodinville is requesting a 6-month time extension to complete the final elements of the Rotary Park project. Completed elements include a skate park, restrooms, plaza, picnic shelters, and playground (about 80% of the project scope). The remaining element is the gravel trail and boardwalk system that runs throughout the remaining 17 acres of the park. The delay in the construction schedule is due to a delay in receiving the necessary construction materials and being able to get the contractor scheduled for the remaining work. The project has been billed to 100%. IAC is withholding the last 10% payment until all scope elements are complete, per policy.

¹ Land and Water Conservation Fund

RESOLUTION 2006-18

IAC 2007-09 OPERATING & CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST

WHEREAS, the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) must submit a 2007-09 Operating and Request Budget to the Office of Financial Management; and

WHEREAS, the operating budget will be in conformance with the Office of Financial Management instructions, including carry-forward, maintenance level, and enhancement items; and

WHEREAS, the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC) must also submit a 2007-2009 Capital Request Budget to the Office of Financial Management; and

WHEREAS, for revenue-supported and federal programs, the capital amounts requested will need to reflect the current revenue projections by the Departments of Transportation and Licensing and estimated federal apportionments; and

WHEREAS, the IAC finds there is a continuing and compelling need for funding to maintain and enhance the state's quality of life by investing in outdoor recreation opportunities and important plant, fish and wildlife habitat; and

WHEREAS, the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program and other IAC-administered grant programs are critical components furthering the goal of maintaining and enhancing the state's quality of life;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that:

1. IAC hereby approves the 2007-2009 Capital Budget request shown below.

Program	2007-09
BFP	Based on 8/06 revenue projections/estimates
ALEA	Based on 8/06 revenue projections/estimates
NOVA	Based on 8/06 revenue projections/estimates
FARR	Based on 8/06 revenue projections/estimates
WWRP	\$100,000,000.00
YAF	Based on 8/06 revenue projections/estimates
LWCF	Based on 8/06 revenue projections/estimates
NRTP	Based on 8/06 revenue projections/estimates
HATCHERY	Based on 8/06 revenue projections/estimates
SRFB	Per SRFB guidance
Biodiversity Council	Per Council guidance

2. The Director is authorized to modify and/or update the amounts as new revenue forecasts become available or to comply with Office of Financial Management budget instructions.
3. The Director is authorized to apply for outside funding sources to supplement the capital budget consistent with the Committee and agency mission.

4. The Director shall submit any necessary reappropriation requests.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

5. The IAC Committee hereby approves the 2007-09 Operating Budget elements as presented, and that enhancements including new positions shall be submitted with the budget if the Director determines they are justified to address staff workload or data system issues.
6. The Director shall modify and/or update the request outlined as necessary to meet the budget needs of the affiliated Board and Councils, to provide for scheduled rent, services, personnel increment dates, and labor contract costs, and to comply with Office of Financial Management directives.
7. The Director is authorized to apply for outside funding sources to supplement the operating budget consistent with the mission of the agency.

Bill Chapman Moved

Jeff Parsons Seconded

June 22, 2006

Pass/Fail